

1 *Echinacea purpurea* for the Long-term Prevention of Viral Respiratory Tract 2 Infections during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Randomized, Open, Controlled, 3 Exploratory Clinical Study

4 Authors

5 Emil Kolev¹, Lilyana Mircheva^{*1}, Michael R. Edwards^{2,3}, Sebastian L. Johnston^{2,3}, Krassimir Kalinov⁴,
6 Rainer Stange⁵, Giuseppe Gancitano⁶, Wim Vanden Berghe⁷, Samo Kreft⁸

7 **Authors and institutional addresses**

8 ¹Clinical Research Center DCC Convex Ltd., 11 A Sinanishko ezero, Str. Sofia 1680, Bulgaria

9 ²Virtus Respiratory Research Limited, London Bioscience Innovation Centre, 2 Royal College St,
10 London, NW1 0NH, United Kingdom

11 ³National Heart Lung Institute, Imperial College London St Marys Campus, Norfolk Place London W2
12 1PG, United Kingdom.

13 ⁴Medistat Ltd. Statistical Services, Mladost 1A, 1729 Sofia, Bulgaria

14 ⁵Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Immanuel Hospital Berlin, Königstrasse 63, D-14109 Berlin,
15 Germany

16 ⁶1st "Tuscania" Paratrooper Regiment Carabinieri, Italian Ministry of Defence, 57127 Livorno, Italy

17 ⁷Laboratory of Protein Chemistry, Proteomics and Epigenetic Signaling (PPES) and Integrated
18 Personalized and Precision Oncology Network (IPPON), Department of Biomedical Sciences,
19 University of Antwerp (UA), Antwerp, Belgium

20 ⁸Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Ljubljana, Aškerčeva cesta 7, Ljubljana, Slovenia

21

22 *corresponding author: lilly@convex.bg; info@convex.bg Tel.: +35929863109

23 Abstract

24 **Introduction:**

25 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination is effective in preventing severe COVID-19, but efficacy in reducing viral load
26 and transmission wanes over time. In addition, the emergence of novel SARS-CoV-2 variants
27 increases the threat of uncontrolled dissemination and additional antiviral therapies are urgently
28 needed for effective containment. In previous *in vitro* studies *Echinacea purpurea* demonstrated
29 strong antiviral activity against enveloped viruses, including SARS-CoV-2. In this study, we examined
30 the potential of *Echinacea purpurea* in preventing and treating respiratory tract infections (RTIs) and
31 in particular, SARS-CoV-2 infections.

32 **Methods:**

33 120 healthy volunteers (m,f, 18 – 75 years) were randomly assigned to *Echinacea* prevention or
34 control group without any intervention. After a run-in week, participants went through 3 prevention

35 cycles of 2, 2 and 1 months with daily 2'400mg *Echinacea purpurea* extract (Echinaforce®, EF). The
 36 prevention cycles were interrupted by breaks of 1 week. Acute respiratory symptoms were treated
 37 with 4'000 mg EF for up to 10 days, and their severity assessed via a diary. Naso/oropharyngeal
 38 swabs and venous blood samples were routinely collected every month and during acute illnesses for
 39 detection and identification of respiratory viruses, including SARS-CoV-2 via RT-qPCR and serology.

40 **Results:**

41 Summarized over all phases of prevention, 21 and 29 samples tested positive for any virus in the EF
 42 and control group, of which 5 and 14 samples tested SARS-CoV-2 positive (RR=0.37, Chi-square test,
 43 $p=0.03$). Overall, 10 and 14 symptomatic episodes occurred, of which 5 and 8 were COVID-19
 44 (RR=0.70, Chi-square test, $p>0.05$). EF treatment when applied during acute episodes significantly
 45 reduced the overall virus load by at least 2.12 \log_{10} or approx. 99% (t-test, $p<0.05$), the time to virus
 46 clearance by 8.0 days for all viruses (Wilcoxon test, $p=0.02$) and by 4.8 days for SARS-CoV-2 ($p>0.05$)
 47 in comparison to control. Finally, EF treatment significantly reduced fever days (1 day vs 11 days, Chi-
 48 square test, $p=0.003$) but not the overall symptom severity. There were fewer COVID-19 related
 49 hospitalizations in the EF treatment group (N=0 vs N=2).

50 **Discussion/Conclusion:**

51 EF exhibited antiviral effects and reduced the risk of viral RTIs, including SARS-CoV-2. By substantially
 52 reducing virus loads in infected subjects, EF offers a supportive addition to existing mandated
 53 treatments like vaccinations. Future confirmatory studies are warranted.

54 **Keywords:** Echinacea purpurea, ethanolic extract, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, antiviral, prevention,
 55 randomized clinical trial

56 **Clinical Trials registration Nr:** NCT05002179

57

58 Introduction

59 Respiratory tract infections (RTI) represent the most frequent illness in western civilization [1].
60 Especially during winter months, a plethora of endemic viruses causes substantial pressure to
61 individuals and the health care system [2]. While common non-influenza illnesses are a massive
62 burden on society and economies, completely novel types of pathogen (variants of influenza or
63 coronaviruses) pose a great threat to humanity. As such, COVID-19 presents the latest and certainly
64 most significant coronavirus zoonosis in the last 20 years.

65 Initial efficacy studies on COVID-19 vaccines raised high hopes of curbing the pandemic through
66 vaccination endeavors. Messenger RNA and vector-based vaccines showed >90% effectiveness in
67 preventing overall infections, progression to severe illness as well as transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [3,
68 4] Expectedly, infection protective effects seemed to slowly reduce over time manifested by
69 increasing breakthrough infections observed even in fully vaccinated individuals [5, 6]. The
70 emergence of novel SARS-CoV-2 mutations, e.g. the delta variant featuring higher peak virus loads
71 and transmissibility than previous variants presents another threat to containment by immunization
72 [7, 8]. Most recent data from US Health Administration, relating to 2.7% of the US population found
73 vaccine effectiveness declining from 87.9% to 48.1% from February to October 2021, with great
74 differences between applied vaccines. Prevention of severe Covid-19 illness remained high
75 throughout the time post vaccination and irrespective of virus mutation in contrast to overall SARS-
76 CoV-2 infections and viral loads, both correlated with the risk of transmitting infections [9].
77 Additional options are urgently needed to effectively attenuate non-severe infections and naso-
78 oropharyngeal virus concentrations in order to further contain viral dissemination [10].

79 Broad antiviral effects, including virucidal activity against coronaviruses (CoV) were attributed to the
80 medicinal plant *Echinacea* [11-13]. *In vitro*, a hydroethanolic extract prepared from freshly-harvested
81 herb and root parts of *Echinacea purpurea* (Echinaforce®, EF) inhibited infectivity of human CoV
82 229E, highly pathogenic MERS- and SARS-CoV, as well as the newly identified SARS-CoV-2 [11]. Two
83 earlier prevention studies in adults and children suggested clinically relevant benefits of EF for
84 enveloped viral pathogens including coronaviruses [14]. The same extract exhibited adaptive
85 immuno-modulating properties *in vivo* by reducing the inflammatory cytokines TNF and IL-1 β and
86 increasing the anti-inflammatory cytokine IL-10 [15]. Immunomodulation instead of immune-
87 stimulation can allow, if necessary, a prolonged preventive use of this extract, to exploit its potential
88 ability to reduce viral loads.

89 This exploratory study aimed to determine antiviral effects of EF during the Covid-19 pandemic and
90 found that the extract potently reduced SARS-CoV-2 infections and viral loads as part of an overall
91 effect on viral respiratory tract infections.

Methods

Study Design and Participants: This randomized, parallel, open, no-treatment controlled, exploratory study was carried out in Bulgaria from 30th of November 2020 (first patient first visit) to 29th of May 2021 (last patient last visit) at one study centre (Diagnostics and Consultation Center Convex EOOD, Sofia). Principally healthy subjects residing in Sofia and neighboring regions were recruited from the principal investigator's database and through referrals. Subjects provided written consent prior to their participation and assignment to either the Echinacea or control group. This study was carried out in compliance with ICH- GCP and according to the Declaration of Helsinki (2013). It was approved by the local ethical review board (Ethics Committee at Diagnostics and Consultation Center Convex Ltd, Sofia, registration nr: 116/26.10.2020) and registered on clinicaltrials.gov (identifier: NCT05002179).

The following exclusion criteria applied: age <18 years, >75 years, positive pregnancy test/no contraception, long-term intake of antimicrobials/antivirals/immune-suppressors, surgical intervention within 3 months prior to study or planned, diabetes mellitus, bronchopulmonary dysfunctions/diseases, immune system/metabolic disorders, serious health conditions, known allergies to ingredients of study medication, participation in clinical study within 30 days prior to study or planned.

After a run-in observation week, participants in the verum group went through 3 prevention cycles of 2, 2 and 1 months (Figure 1) with 3 times daily 800 mg EF extract (2'400 mg/day). We chose 1-week breaks for treatment interruption following regulatory advice, although the duration of pausing was not officially stipulated.

Acute RTI episodes were treated with five times daily 800mg EF extract (4'000 mg/day) for up to 10 days. In the control group, EF was not applied neither as prevention nor as therapy, but subjects were observed in parallel for the same period. Subjects were randomly assigned to study groups according to the randomization list (generated by SAS®/PLAN module). Beside the preventive intake of EF in the verum group, participants were allowed to continue previous treatment and therapies throughout the study and were free to use concomitant treatment during acute RTI episodes. Any concomitant treatment was recorded.



Figure 1: Illustration of the intervention scheme showing phases of EF prevention (blue) interrupted by phases of breaks (grey) with study visits (V1-V7) for routine virus sampling.

Subjects returned to the study centre on a monthly basis (visits V1-V7, Figure 1) and during acute symptomatic episodes on days 1, 2, 5 and 10 to provide naso/oropharyngeal (NP/OP) swabs and venous blood samples for virus detection and quantification. Detections, pre-existing at V1 or occurring during the run-in phase before the start of prevention at visit 2 were not taken into account for the analysis of incidence rates. The study nurse visited SARS-CoV-2 positive subjects who were confined to domestic quarantine in accordance with local law, to collect NP/OP and blood samples every 5th day until they were tested SARS-CoV-2 negative. Venous blood samples (7.0 mL) were additionally drawn for analysis of serology (see below).

Subjects were equipped with a symptom diary to rate the severity of respiratory symptoms (runny nose, congested nose, sneezing, cough, shivering, malaise, fatigue, headache, myalgia, anosmia, insomnia, sore throat) upon occurrence and for up to 10 days using a Likert scale [absent=0 to severe=3] and body temperature [°C, arm pit measurement] according to Jackson (1958) [16]. Adverse events (AE) during study conduct were collected via patient diary and during study visits, classified according to preferred / lowest-level term, severity and causal relationship by the investigator. AEs were coded according to the MedDRA (version 17.1GE). Concomitant medication use was collected via patient diary and during study visits and classified according to WHO ATC, L3 Code.

Laboratory procedures: Nasopharyngeal (NP) and oropharyngeal (OP) swabs for general RTI viral detection were collected using sterile FLOQ swabs (COPAN SA, Italy) and transferred to eNAT medium tube (COPAN SA, Italy). Sample preparation and reverse transcriptase – quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) measurement were done using VIASURE RT-PCR detection kit for respiratory viruses using the Respiratory Panel IV (CerTest BIOTEC S.L., Spain). The collected samples were screened for presence of rhinoviruses, enteroviruses, adenoviruses and enveloped viruses including: influenza A (including H1N1)/B, parainfluenza 1/2/3/4, respiratory syncytial virus A/B, coronaviruses: 229E/NL63/OC43/HKU1, metapneumovirus and bocavirus.

NP and OP swabs for SARS-CoV-2 detection were collected using sterile polyurethane foam bud Σ -Transwabs (Medical Wire & Equipment (MWE), United Kingdom) with breakpoints, pooled and transferred to one tube of 1 mL Amies liquid culture medium (MWE, United Kingdom). Sample preparation and RT-qPCR measurement were done using a separate SARS-CoV-2 panel (Taqpath Covid 19 –ThermoFisher Scientific, USA). An additional serological analysis of venous blood samples was carried out for qualitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 IgG/IgM done with the Elecsys Anti SARS-CoV-2 kit (Roche Diagnostics Int., Switzerland).

All samples were stored at -80 °C until further processing at the study centre and analyzed by Bodimed diagnostic laboratories (Sofia, Bulgaria) in strict adherence to the manufacturer's diagnostic protocols. Virus presence was detected by RT-qPCR in NP/OP swabs and serology. Cycle threshold values (Ct) were deducted from RT-qPCR measurements to estimate relative differences of virus genome copies, i.e. the virus load. SARS-CoV-2 S-, N- and ORF1ab-genes cycle threshold values (Ct) were pooled for further mathematical analysis of virus loads (see below).

Intervention: Echinaforce® tablets (EF) used in this study contained 400mg of liquid extract (extraction solvent 65% v/v ethanol) of freshly harvested *Echinacea purpurea* (95% aerial parts and 5% root, DER = 1:11-12) and excipients. The tablets were placed into dark brown glass bottles with a screw closure and sealed. Each bottle contained 120 tablets sufficient for 20 days of prevention. Good manufacturing practice (GMP)-compliant manufacturing and batch-release was performed by A. Vogel AG (Roggwil, Switzerland). Each included subject randomized into the EF prevention group received a number of glasses sufficient for each prevention cycle. Compliance was determined based on weighing returned study product glasses upon end of prevention cycles and a tolerance of $\pm 20\%$ accepted for adherence to therapy.

Sample size calculation & statistics: This study principally used descriptive biometric approaches to estimate effect sizes. However, the study was conceptualized and large enough to confirm a clinically relevant difference for a first parameter in hierarchy of pre-defined variables, i.e. incidences of viral respiratory tract infections (RTIs), with appropriate statistical power (nQuery Advisor, 2017, version 7.0, sample size and power calculation from Statsols-Statistical Solutions Ltd, IRL): A two group Chi-square test with a two-sided significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) had 80% power to detect a difference in RTI incidence rate of 0.12, with absolute rates of 0.10 in the verum group and 0.23 for control, when the sample size in each group was at least 50. In this study, we planned to recruit and observe N=120 healthy volunteers, equally randomized (Echinacea/verum group: N=60 and control group: N=60).

Relative \log_{10} change in virus load after 5 and 10 days of treatment compared to baseline (day 1) during RTI episodes was calculated by approximation from the Cycle threshold values (Ct) of RT-qPCR measurements in accordance with methods described elsewhere [[17, 18]. Ct values of treatment responders falling below the detection limit of the respective RT-qPCR assay were set to the maximal number of cycles run in the respiratory qPCR panel = 45 Ct, and of the SARS-CoV-2 qPCR panel = 40 Ct. Subsequently missing Ct values due to hospitalization of severe COVID-19 (2 cases) were replaced by the last observation carried forward principle up to day 10.

Safety variables were analyzed in the safety group (SAF), which included all subjects with at least one documented intake of the study medication. Analyses of effectiveness variables were carried out on

the intention to treat group (ITT), which included all subjects with at least one evaluable effectiveness variable. Thus in this study, the ITT group was identical to the SAF group.

Continuous variables were expressed descriptively and post-hoc comparison tests carried out as indicated. Relative risk (RR) and odds ratio (OR) were adjusted for the relative subject observation time in order to take into account different observation periods in both study groups due to some participants not undertaking prevention cycle 3. Adjusted RR and OR were displayed with their 95% confidence intervals (CI). Two-sided p-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were done using the SAS® system (version 9.4).

Results

Baseline characteristics

Overall, N=120 volunteers were included into the clinical trial in November/December 2020 and observed over a period of 23 weeks, resp. 5.5 months, as shown in Figure 1. 100% were Caucasian with a mean age of 36 years, a high proportion of smokers (36.7%) and with average body measures as shown in Table 1. 37 subjects (30.8%) had positive RT-qPCR or serology detections for SARS-CoV-2 upon inclusion (EF:20, control:17, p>0.05). Rates of smokers, overall co-morbidities and in particular hypertension in particular were slightly higher in the EF group as shown in Table 1. Otherwise, the two study groups were comparable.


Table 1. Demographics and co-morbidities.

Demographics	EF	Control	p-value
N	60	60	
Age	35.2(11.9)	36.6(13.6)	0.546 ¹
Sex (f/m)	33/27(55%/45%)	32/28(53%/47%)	0.855 ²
Height (m)	1.73(0.08)	1.71(0.10)	0.383 ¹
Weight (kg)	72.3(17.0)	70.6(14.5)	0.537 ¹
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.1(4.9)	23.8(3.4)	0.755 ¹
Smokers	25(41.7%)	19(31.7%)	0.256 ²
-Number of cigarettes/day	10.6(7.7)	12.0(7.8)	0.582 ¹
Co-Morbidities, overall	16 (26.7%)	6(10.0%)	0.018 ²
-Hypertension	4(6.7%)	0(0%)	
-Hashimoto's thyroiditis	1(1.7%)	2(3.3%)	
-Osteoporosis	2(3.3%)	0(0%)	
-	2(3.3%)	0(0%)	
Hypothyroidism/Thyroidectomy			
-Hyperuricemia	0(0%)	1(1.7%)	
-Myoma uteri/Uterine polyp	1(1.7%)	1(1.7%)	

-Allergic rhinitis	1(1.7%)	0(0%)
-Chronic sinusitis	1(1.7%)	0(0%)
-Hip osteoarthritis	1(1.7%)	0(0%)
-Dyslipidemia	0(0%)	1(1.7%)
-Episodes of headache	0(0%)	1(1.7%)
-Gastroesophageal reflux disease	1(1.7%)	0(0%)
-Nephrolithiasis	1(1.7%)	0(0%)
-Psoriasis	1(1.7%)	0(0%)

206 Data are n (%), mean (SD). ¹Student's t-test, ²Chi-Square test, ³

207 As depicted in the (consort) flow diagram (Figure 2), N=2 subjects were screening failures due to
 208 violation of in/exclusion criteria and N=120 subjects were ultimately randomized. One participant
 209 (1.67%) of the EF group dropped out prior taking any study medication and 1 more (1.67%) during
 210 study conduct. N=58 (96.7%) in the EF group and N=60 (100%) in the control group completed the
 211 two prevention cycles (2 and 2 months). An amendment to the study allowed to voluntarily extend
 212 the initially approved 2 x 2 prevention cycles by another month of prevention in both study groups.
 213 N=49 (81.7%) and 59 (98.3%) decided to complete prevention cycle 3 (1 month). Dropouts in this
 214 study were not replaced. All subjects that decided to revoke their consent during conduct of the
 215 study provided evaluable datasets until the time point of withdrawal. The overall subject observation
 216 time in the EF and control group was 1252 and 1316 subject-weeks, respectively (ratio: 0.951).



217
 218 **Figure 2.** Subject disposition tree. ¹Screening-failure, ²Withdrawal of consent prior intake of study
 219 medication, SAF: Safety group, ITT: Intention to treat group.

220 Overall, 59 (EF) and 60 subjects (control) contributed datasets evaluable for efficacy and safety
 221 variables (SAF/ITT). At study start, no subject was vaccinated against COVID-19. Three subjects (EF: 2,

control: 1) received a first SARS-CoV-2 vaccine dose towards the end of the first prevention phase (prior visit 4). As few as 12 subjects (EF: 7, control: 5) received complete vaccination by the end of the study (prior visit 7). Overall, no significant differences between groups were detected and treatment compliance was 92% (95%CI: 89%/95%) in the treatment group.

Incidence of Viral Respiratory Tract Infections and SARS-CoV-2

Table 2A shows the incidences of positive virus detections, measured by RT-qPCR and/or serology during phases of prevention with EF or the matching observation period in the control group. An overall antiviral effect is evident from the 21 (EF) and 29 (control) samples positively tested for any respiratory virus. It reveals an accentuated specificity towards enveloped viruses, with 11 (EF) and 20 (control) positive detections, which finally peaks in 5 (EF) and 14 (control) SARS-CoV-2 positive detections, respectively. The corresponding relative risk (RR) reduced from RR = 0.748 for any respiratory virus ($p=0.186$), to a statistically significant RR = 0.517 for coronaviruses ($p=0.046$) and RR = 0.369 for SARS-CoV-2 virus infections ($p=0.030$) (Table 2A). EF prevention thus resulted in a virus protective effect size of 25% (relative risk reduction) for any virus, of 48% for coronaviruses and of 63% for SARS-CoV-2 virus in particular.

Preventive effects of EF observed at the level of symptomatic respiratory tract infection episodes (RTI episodes) seemed to point into the same direction (Table 2B). The overall relative risk to encounter symptomatic RTI episodes was reduced by 23%, respectively 30% for episodes caused by SARS-CoV-2. Although showing highly similar possible effect sizes, the study was ultimately underpowered to show statistical significance at this level, as only every third virus infections turned into a symptomatic RTI episode.

Table 2. Incidences of RTI virus detections (A) and symptomatic RTI episodes (B) during phases of prevention.

(A) RTI Virus detections	EF	Control	OR. ¹	95%CI for OR	RR ¹	95%CI for RR	p-value ²
All RTI viruses	21	29	0.61	0.29/1.26	0.748	0.49/1.16	0.186
Enveloped viruses	11	20	0.47	0.20/1.09	0.568	0.30/1.09	0.077
Coronaviruses	10	20	0.42	0.18/0.995	0.517	0.27/1.02	0.046
SARS-CoV-2	5	14	0.31	0.1/0.92	0.369	0.14/0.96	0.03
(B) Symptomatic RTI episodes	EF	Control	OR	95%CI for OR	RR	95%CI for RR	p-value ²
Overall ³	10	14	0.71	0.29/1.76	0.77	0.37/1.60	0.34
All RTI viruses	7	10	0.73	0.26/2.05	0.77	0.31/1.89	0.433

Enveloped viruses	6	9	0.68	0.23/2.05	0.72	0.28/1.91	0.389
Coronaviruses	6	9	0.68	0.23/2.05	0.72	0.28/1.91	0.389
SARS-CoV-2	5	8	0.66	0.20/2.15	0.70	0.24/2.03	0.396

¹OR: Odds ratio (OR) /risk ratio (RR) adjusted for relative subject-observation time, ²Chi-square test, ³incl. symptomatic episodes without any RTI virus detection.

During the two weeks of break between prevention cycles, respiratory viruses were present in 10 and 5 samples in the EF prevention- and control group, respectively (p=0.05, Chi-square test). 5 were endemic pathogens (CoV-NL63 [3], parainfluenza [1], rhinovirus [1]) and as few as 6 (EF prevention) and 4 (control) SARS-CoV-2 infections occurred, all of which remained asymptomatic. These detections were not included in the primary analysis, which focused on incidences during the treatment periods with Echinaforce.

Virus Concentration in Oro-/Nasopharyngeal Samples

During symptomatic RTI episodes, oro-/nasopharyngeal sampling was intensified to determine virus loads and time to virus clearance in EF treatment and control groups. While initial virus loads (Ct values) on day 1 of RTI episodes were comparable (Table S1A), we found evidence for significantly more efficient reduction of virus load under EF treatment relative to baseline (Tables 2 & S1B). After 5 and 10 days, EF treatment reduced overall virus concentration significantly in comparison to day 1, while under control it remained unchanged until day 5. For both time points, the log₁₀ΔCt reduction was with -2.12 (95%CI: -0.90/-3.34, t-test, p=0.0018) and -2.82 (95%CI: -1.04/-4.59, t-test, p=0.0327) higher under EF treatment (Table 2) in comparison to control. This corresponded to a significant >99% reduction in relative virus concentration. Highly comparable and equally significant results were obtained for SARS-CoV-2 virus loads with observed log₁₀ΔCt reductions of -2.18 (day 5, 95%CI: -0.77/-3.58, t-test, p=0.0054) and -2.21 (day 10, 95%CI: -0.12/-4.29, t-test, p=0.0399) in comparison to control.

Table 2. Log change in virus load during EF treated (Echinaforce) vs. untreated (control) symptomatic RTI episodes.

	All Viral RTI Episodes		SARS-CoV-2 episodes	
	day 5	day10	day 5	day10
EF				
n	11	11	8	8
Mean log ₁₀ ΔCt	-2.19(1.33)	-4.73(1.91)	-2.14(1.28)	-3.92(1.47)
Median	-2.38	-4.59	-2.22	-4.25
95%CI for Mean	-3.08/-1.30	-6.01/-3.45	-3.21/-1.07	-5.15/-2.68

Control				
n	9	9	7	7
Mean log ₁₀ ΔCt	-0.07(1.26)	-1.91(1.85)	0.03(1.24)	-1.71(2.08)
Median	0	-2.2	0	-1.9
95%CI for Mean	-1.04/0.90	-3.33/-0.49	-1.11/1.18	-3.63/0.21
p-value ¹	0.0018	0.0327	0.0054	0.0399

Data are mean(SD) change in logarithmized ΔCt values by day 5 and 10 of treatment relative to baseline on day 1 (log₁₀ΔCt)

¹Welch's t-test using Satterthwaite modification comparing EF treatment vs control.

All SARS-CoV-2 infections were followed-up every 5 days after day 10 until naso-/oropharyngeal samples tested negative. Compared to control, EF treatment significantly shortened the average time to virus clearance (qPCR-negative) by 8.02 days for all viruses (95%CI: 15/1 days, Wilcoxon two-sample Test, p=0.0194) and by 4.83 days (95%CI: 10/1 days, Wilcoxon two-sample test, p=0.118) in the case of SARS-CoV-2 as shown in Table 3. The analysis of all naso/oropharyngeal samples collected during prevention phases (during asymptomatic/symptomatic RTI) overall resulted in a difference of -2.17 ΔCt (95%CI: -4.68/0.34 ΔCt, t-test, p=0.09) in comparison to control (Table S2), matched well with results obtained for acute treatment (>99% virus concentration reduction).

Table 3. Time-to-virus clearance (qPCR negative) during treated (EF) and untreated (control) viral symptomatic RTI episodes.

Time to response (days)	All viral RTI Episodes			SARS-CoV-2 episodes		
	EF	Reference (Control)	p-value ¹	EF	Reference (Control)	p-value ¹
n	8	10		5	8	
Mean	11.4(2.1)	19.4(8.6)	0.019	11.8(1.8)	16.6(6.2)	0.118
Median	12	18.5		13	16	
95%CI for Mean	9.6/13.2	13.3/25.5		9.6/14.0	11.5/21.8	

Data are mean(SD). Analyzable sample sets per day and study groups (n) are indicated. ¹Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test with t-approximation.

Symptomatic Expression of (viral) symptomatic RTIs and use of co-medication

Compared to control, EF treatment significantly reduced the number of fever days (defined as a temperature of ≥37.8 °C) from 11 (control) to only 1 day in the verum group (RR=0.1, Chi-square test, p=0.0048) and the average body temperature over 6 out of 10 days of acute treatment days significantly (Table S3). Otherwise, no effects on symptom expression were observed. The use of co-

medication during RTI episodes was frequent and different in both study groups with 38 incidences of use during 13 RTI episodes in the EF group and 49 incidences during 14 RTI episodes in the control group (ratio: 0.84). It is noteworthy that the use of RTI symptom-related medication (EF: 3, control: 8, ratio: 0.4) was higher in the control group.

Safety

Overall, 3 and 5 adverse events (AE) were noted for N=3 and N=5 subjects in the EF and control group but none was in relation to study medication and all resolved without sequelae. Notably, out of 5 AEs recorded in the control group, 2 serious COVID-19 illnesses that led to hospitalization as serious adverse events (SAE) were reported but none with *Echinaforce*, despite the higher rate of co-morbidities in the EF group as shown earlier (Table 1).

Discussion

The results of this study provide further evidence for antiviral effects of Echinaforce extract (EF) against respiratory viruses, including SARS-CoV2, despite the relatively small sample size and exploratory design.

5 months EF prevention resulted in a 25% infection reduction with any respiratory virus that increased to 43% for enveloped viruses and to 48% for coronaviruses. Interestingly, the strongest risk reduction (63%) was found for infection with SARS-CoV2 viruses, pointing towards a specificity against enveloped viruses overall. The observed protective effect size for SARS-CoV-2 should certainly not be over interpreted, but viewed as further addition in the collation to the significant reduction of SARS-CoV-2 and overall virus loads of more than 2.12log during acute RTI episodes. Although the a priori defined, clinically relevant effect size of 25% was reached at the level of any RTI virus, significance was only attained for the prevention of coronaviruses, and for SARS-CoV-2. Assumptions for the power calculation were based on the pre-pandemic situation and did not take into account containment measures such as disinfection, wearing masks or social distancing. For example, influenza viruses were not observed in the current study and the demonstrated, preventive effects of Echinaforce for this particular virus could not be reproduced [19].

Nevertheless, our results are consistent with, and a further extension of earlier clinical prevention studies comparing Echinaforce extract to control/placebo on endemic RTI viruses. Jawad applied EF extract continuously over 4 months and identified an odds ratio OR =0.49 (p= 0.0114) for infections with enveloped viruses, including endemic coronaviruses such as CoV-229, HKU1 or OC43 [20]. In another study, the same EF extract was administered for 2 x 2 months for prevention in children, interrupted with a one-week treatment break [19]. Consistent with our findings, Ogal (2020)

observed significantly fewer infections with enveloped viruses in the Echinaforce group (OR = 0.43, $p=0.0038$), further substantiating the relevance of antiviral effects *in vivo* [19].

In this study, 1-week breaks succeeded every second prevention month during which no symptomatic RTI episodes occurred but routine testing identified 15 positive PCR/serology tests. In a sensitivity analysis, their consideration for the analysis slightly increased the relative risk with $RR=0.68$ (95% CI: 0.35/1.32, $p>0.05$) for SARS-CoV-2 infections. Though not statistically significant, these results might be an indication for quick decline in antiviral effects of *Echinacea* upon treatment cessation. To keep preventive effects high throughout, it may be therefore suggested shortening treatment breaks to a few days, or treating continuously, without treatment breaks. On the rise of the global pandemic, SARS-CoV-2 vaccines have been developed with an extraordinary speed and have mostly proven their effectivity in reducing severe COVID-19 illnesses [21]. Vaccines were also initially found to be effective in reducing peak and overall virus loads more efficiently [22, 23]. A 2.8 – 4.5-fold reduction of peak virus loads in individuals vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 was reported > 2 weeks post-immunization [23]. This effect apparently reduced over 6 months post-immunization and with increasing activity of the delta-variant [22, 23]. Obviously, there is currently growing interest in additive treatments [24, 25] with proven effectiveness in reducing virus load in the nasal/oral cavity in infected individuals in order to help reduce probability of virus shedding and ultimately transmission [26]. These preparations should ideally be widely available, easy to use and safe[24]. Our findings demonstrate that EF treatment during acute RTI episodes significantly reduced virus loads (all viruses and SARS-CoV-2) by more than 99%. This was further consistent with observations by Nicolussi, (2021) observing a 98.5% reduction on day 2 of illness treated with the same EF preparation ($p<0.046$) and the shortened time to become virus free (qPCR negative) [14]. Our results represent averages over 5 months of prevention and we did not monitor a potential decay of antiviral effects over time. However, preliminary results suggest that respiratory viruses show limited ability to evade antiviral effects attributed to Echinaforce extract, possibly due to the multicomponent character of plant extractions [12]. This apparently also applies to most relevant SARS-CoV-2 variants of concerns, including the alpha, beta, gamma and delta variants, as a most recent study demonstrated *in vitro* [27]. Potential effects of the EF treatment on the infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 variants in infected patients are currently being investigated in more detail.

In contrast to the overall symptomatic expression, we observed treatment effects on development of fever and possibly also on severe COVID-19 (hospitalization). The higher rate of concomitant cold medication in the control group could well have masked further effects of the *Echinaforce* treatment on the symptom level requiring confirmation in larger clinical settings.

As mentioned, this study has limitations, first it used descriptive statistical methods, was small in size and secondly it did not use placebo for control and was not blinded. Nevertheless, the design was still considered valid to provide essential evidence for the preventive use of Echinacea during the COVID-19 pandemic for the following reasons: a first parameter was defined as incidence of (viral) RTIs, for which sample size calculation found sufficient statistical power of >80% for 120 included subjects.

The lack of blinding/placebo might be considered a methodological weakness, but it can be assumed that the placebo effect/knowledge of therapy have only limited effects on detection of viral pathogens in NP/OP samples and blood serum. We therefore think that the study design was suitable to address the research question on antiviral effects of Echinaforce *in vivo*.

Conclusion:

A commercial preparation of *Echinacea purpurea* in the licensed dosage (Echinaforce extract), represents a safe, easy-to-use and widely available cost-efficient antiviral with effects in preventing respiratory tract infections, including SARS-CoV2 and reducing virus load. It may add well to existing counter measures in the current COVID-19 pandemic like vaccinations, social distancing and wearing protective facemasks. Future confirmatory studies are warranted.

Acknowledgements

Funding: Sponsorship for this study and Rapid Service Fee were funded by A.Vogel AG. Sebastian L. Johnston is a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Emeritus Senior Investigator and receives support from the Asthma UK Clinical Chair (Grant CH11SJ), European Research Council Advanced Grant 788575 and the NIHR Imperial Biomedical Research Centre (BRC). The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Authorship: All named authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published.

Authors' contributions: Conceptualization: Giuseppe Gancitano, Lilyana Mircheva, Emil Kolev, Krassimir Kalinov, Wim vanden Berghe; Methodology: Giuseppe Gancitano, Emil Kolev, Lilyana Mircheva, Krassimir Kalinov, Wim vanden Berghe; Formal analysis and investigation: Giuseppe Gancitano, Emil Kolev, Krassimir Kalinov, Lilyana Mircheva, Samo Kreft, Wim vanden Berghe, Michael R. Edwards, Sebastian L. Johnston, Rainer Stange; Writing - original draft preparation: Giuseppe

Gancitano , Emil Kolev, Lilyana Mircheva, Krassimir Kalinov, Wim vanden Berghe, Samo Kreft, Michael R. Edwards, Sebastian L. Johnston, Rainer Stange; Writing – review and editing: Giuseppe Gancitano , Emil Kolev, Lilyana Mircheva, Krassimir Kalinov, Wim vanden Berghe, Samo Kreft, Michael R. Edwards, Sebastian L. Johnston, Rainer Stange

Medical writing, editorial, and other assistance: Support and editorial assistance in the preparation of this article was provided and funded by A. Vogel AG.

Disclosures: “Michael R. Edwards, Samo Kreft and Giuseppe Gancitano declare that they have no conflict of interest. Emil Kolev, Lilyana Mircheva, Krassimir Kalinov, Sebastian L Johnston, Wim vanden Berghe and Rainer Stange have received honorarium funds from the study sponsor. This study was sponsored by A. Vogel AG, Roggwil, Switzerland. The role of the sponsor was to supply the study medication, which was the Echinaforce chewable tablets.

Compliance with ethics guidelines: The Ethics Committee at Diagnostics and Consultation Center Convex Ltd, Sofia, registration nr: 116/26.10.2020) authorized the study protocol (version 1.0, 29. October 2020). Amendments to the study protocol were generated and approved (version 2.0, 17. December 2020, and version 3.0, 14. April 2021). The clinical study is registered at Clinicaltrials.gov (identifier: NCT05002179).

Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects before they participated in the study. Accordance with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki/Good Clinical Practice guidelines (2013), adherence to national/regional regulatory requirements, and data protection were ensured permanently.

Data availability: The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

1. Rotbart HA, Hayden FG. Picornavirus infections: a primer for the practitioner. Arch Fam Med. 2000 Sep-Oct;9(9):913-20. DOI: 10.1001/archfami.9.9.913. PMID: 11031400.
2. Fendrick AM, Monto AS, Nightengale B, Sarnes M. The economic burden of non-influenza-related viral respiratory tract infection in the United States. Arch Intern Med. 2003 Feb 24;163(4):487-94. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.163.4.487. PMID: 12588210.
3. Pilishvili T, Fleming-Dutra KE, Farrar JL, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna COVID-19 Vaccines Among Health Care Personnel - 33 U.S.

413 Sites, January-March 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 May 21;70(20):753-758.
 414 DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7020e2. PMID: 34014909; PMCID: PMC8136422.

415 4. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of
 416 BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
 417 Health Care Personnel, First Responders, and Other Essential and Frontline Workers — Eight
 418 U.S. Locations, December 2020–March 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2021;70:495–
 419 500. DOI: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7013e3. PMID: 33793460; PMCID: PMC8022879.

420 5. Mizrahi B, Lotan R, Kalkstein N, et al. Correlation of SARS-CoV-2-breakthrough infections to
 421 time-from-vaccine. *Nat Commun*. 2021 Nov 4;12(1):6379. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-021-26672-
 422 3. PMID: 34737312; PMCID: PMC8569006.

423 6. Puranik A, Lenehan PJ, Silvert E, et al. Comparison of two highly-effective mRNA vaccines for
 424 COVID-19 during periods of Alpha and Delta variant prevalence. *medRxiv [Preprint]*. 2021
 425 Aug 9;2021.08.06.21261707. DOI: 10.1101/2021.08.06.21261707.

426 7. Ong SWX, Chiew CJ, Ang LW, et al. Clinical and virological features of SARS-CoV-2 variants of
 427 concern: a retrospective cohort study comparing B.1.1.7 (Alpha), B.1.315 (Beta), and
 428 B.1.617.2 (Delta). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Aug 23;ciab721. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciab721. Epub
 429 ahead of print. PMID: 34423834; PMCID: PMC8522361.

430 8. Wang Y, Chen R, Hu F, et al. Transmission, viral kinetics and clinical characteristics of the
 431 emergent SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Guangzhou, China. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021
 432 Oct;40:101129. DOI: 10.1016/j.eclim.2021.101129. Epub 2021 Sep 12. PMID: 34541481;
 433 PMCID: PMC8435265.

434 9. Cohn BA, Cirillo PM, Murphy CC, Krigbaum NY, Wallace AW. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine protection
 435 and deaths among US veterans during 2021. *Science*. 2021 Nov 4:eabm0620. DOI:
 436 10.1126/science.abm0620. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34735261.

437 10. Goldberg Y, Mandel M, Bar-On YM, et al. Waning Immunity after the BNT162b2 Vaccine in
 438 Israel. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 Oct 27;NEJMoa2114228. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2114228. Epub
 439 ahead of print. PMID: 34706170; PMCID: PMC8609604.

440 11. Signer J, Jonsdottir HR, Albrich WC, Strasser M, Züst R, Ryter S, et al. Author Correction: In
 441 vitro virucidal activity of Echinaforce®, an Echinacea purpurea preparation, against
 442 coronaviruses, including common cold coronavirus 229E and SARS-CoV-2. *Virol J*. 2020 Nov
 443 9;17(1):172. DOI: 10.1186/s12985-020-01439-2. Erratum for: *Virol J*. 2020 Sep 9;17(1):136.
 444 PMID: 33168000; PMCID: PMC7649903.

12. Pleschka S, Stein M, Schoop R, Hudson JB. Anti-viral properties and mode of action of standardized *Echinacea purpurea* extract against highly pathogenic avian influenza virus (H5N1, H7N7) and swine-origin H1N1 (S-OIV). *Virology*. 2009 Nov 13;6:197. DOI: 10.1186/1743-422X-6-197. PMID: 19912623; PMCID: PMC2785784.
13. Sharma M, Anderson SA, Schoop R, Hudson JB. Induction of multiple pro-inflammatory cytokines by respiratory viruses and reversal by standardized *Echinacea*, a potent antiviral herbal extract. *Antiviral Res*. 2009 Aug;83(2):165-70. DOI: 10.1016/j.antiviral.2009.04.009. Epub 2009 May 3. PMID: 19409931.
14. Nicolussi S, Gancitano G, Stange R, Klein P, Ogal M.A *Echinacea* as a Potential Weapon against Coronavirus Infections? Mini-Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. GA 69th Annual Meeting 2021. 5.- 8. Sept. 2021.PC3-11.
15. Ritchie MR, Gertsch J, Klein P, Schoop R. Effects of Echinaforce® treatment on ex vivo-stimulated blood cells. *Phytomedicine*. 2011 Jul 15;18(10):826-31. DOI: 10.1016/j.phymed.2011.05.011. PMID: 21726792.
16. Jackson GG, Dowling HF, Spiesman IG, Boand AV. Transmission of the common cold to volunteers under controlled conditions. I. The common cold as a clinical entity. *AMA Arch Intern Med*. 1958 Feb;101(2):267-78. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.1958.00260140099015. PMID: 13497324.
17. Weishaupt R, Buchkov A, Kolev E, et al. Reduction of Viral Load in Patients With Acute Sore Throats: Results From an Observational Clinical Trial With *Echinacea* and *Salvia* Lozenges, 20 April 2021, PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square [<https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-425085/v1>]
18. van Elden LJ, Sachs AP, van Loon AM, et al. Enhanced severity of virus associated lower respiratory tract disease in asthma patients may not be associated with delayed viral clearance and increased viral load in the upper respiratory tract. *J Clin Virol*. 2008 Feb;41(2):116-21. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcv.2007.10.028. Epub 2007 Dec 21. PMID: 18096430; PMCID: PMC7172053.
19. Ogal M, Johnston SL, Klein P, Schoop R. *Echinacea* reduces antibiotic usage in children through respiratory tract infection prevention: a randomized, blinded, controlled clinical trial. *Eur J Med Res*. 2021 Apr 8;26(1):33. DOI: 10.1186/s40001-021-00499-6. PMID: 33832544; PMCID: PMC8028575.

20. Jawad M, Schoop R, Suter A, Klein P, Eccles R. Safety and Efficacy Profile of *Echinacea purpurea* to Prevent Common Cold Episodes: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med*. 2012;2012:841315. DOI: 10.1155/2012/841315. Epub 2012 Sep 16. PMID: 23024696; PMCID: PMC3457740.
21. Lurie N, Saville M, Hatchett R, Halton J. Developing Covid-19 Vaccines at Pandemic Speed. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 May 21;382(21):1969-1973. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2005630. Epub 2020 Mar 30. PMID: 32227757.
22. Pouwels KB, Pritchard E, Matthews PC, et al. Effect of Delta variant on viral burden and vaccine effectiveness against new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the UK. *Nat Med*. 2021 Oct 14. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-021-01548-7. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 34650248.
23. Levine-Tiefenbrun M, Yelin I, Katz R, et al. Initial report of decreased SARS-CoV-2 viral load after inoculation with the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Nat Med*. 2021 May;27(5):790-792. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-021-01316-7. Epub 2021 Mar 29. PMID: 33782619.
24. Llivisaca-Contreras SA, Naranjo-Morán J, Pino-Acosta A, et al. Plants and Natural Products with Activity against Various Types of Coronaviruses: A Review with Focus on SARS-CoV-2. *Molecules*. 2021 Jul;26(13): 4099. doi: 10.3390/molecules26134099. PMID: 34279439.
25. Declerck K, Novo CP, Griens L, et al. *Echinacea purpurea* (L.) Moench treatment of monocytes promotes tonic interferon signaling, increased innate immunity gene expression and DNA repeat hypermethylated silencing of endogenous retroviral sequences. *BMC Complement Med Ther*. 2021 May; 21(141). doi.org/10.1186/s12906-021-03310-5.
26. Huang N, Pérez P, Kato T, et. al. SARS-CoV-2 infection of the oral cavity and saliva. *Nat Med*. 2021 May;27(5):892-903. DOI: 10.1038/s41591-021-01296-8. Epub 2021 Mar 25. PMID: 33767405; PMCID: PMC8240394.
27. Vimalanathan S, Shehata M, Kannan S, Delbue S, D'Alessandro S, Pariani E, Pleschka S. Broad antiviral effects of *Echinacea purpurea* against SARS-CoV-2 effects. 2021 (submitted report).